

Lakeside Redevelopment
Laulima
(PLN17-00247)

After Packet Comments

Planning Commission
May 28, 2020

Sue Colbert

From: Megan Ahlburn <mahlburn@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, May 25, 2020 3:42 PM
To: Sue Colbert
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Major Laulima Lakeside Redevelopment Concerns

Hi! I have owned a house on Speckled in Kings Beach for 18 years and wanted to reach out as I am deeply concerned and disturbed with the Laulima proposal. Why is there no consideration of the long game here? If it's apparently all about the money, do you think single family homes and luxury condos, in the middle of a designated mixed use downtown, benefits the larger community financially in any way down the road? What is "mixed use" when the Laulima development has a residential to retail ratio of 10 to 1. This is a dangerous precedent to set. And they say now they don't have the money to build a hotel on the lakeside? Oh how my heart just breaks for them! Figure it out Laulima!

Please, please, please don't sell our community out with these short sighted, greedy plans. The lakeside must be kept mixed use, not privatized. Think of how amazing to have a new hotel, restaurants, retails and SOME residential in the hopes that a beautiful downtown Kings Beach raises property values for all! Hence the county would make more on property taxes from 5000 people not 20! Seems extraordinarily short sighted to even consider what Laulima is proposing. This is the chance to make downtown Kings Beach spectacular! Don't blow it!!

Lastly, thanks for your time and I hope you are healthy, happy and safe! Take care, Megan

Sent from my iPad

From: noreply@civicplus.com
Sent: Sunday, May 24, 2020 10:21 AM
To: Shirlee Herrington; Kara Conklin; Sue Colbert; Meghan Schwartz; Lisa Carnahan
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Online Form Submittal: Public Comment Submission - Planning Commission

Public Comment Submission - Planning Commission

During the Covid-19 Pandemic, Placer County is committed to public participation in County Government in a manner that is consistent with guidance provided by our Public Health Official. We have provided this form that can be used to submit comments to the Planning Commission.

First and Last Name	Dana Ash
Email Address (Optional)	sierralover@gmail.com
Agenda Item (Optional)	Laulima Kings Beach Development
Comments	<p>I am writing to input my stance on the proposed development project that would use a significant chunk of Kings Beach lakefront for the purpose of a handful of high end privately-owned condominiums. I would venture to say that by not investing our resources in workforce housing and/or hotel rooms for visitors, Placer County is not doing what is in the best interests of a majority of tax payers. Our town is already in a dire situation in terms of housing and tourist accommodations. Much of the housing that used to be available for workers is now being used as vacation rentals and second homes. Our town cannot thrive without our workforce and hotel rooms for folks to come visit, walk the town and spend money. By allowing this kind of development, Placer County is looking after the interests of an out-of-the-area developer and a handful of elites who will likely use those condos on a very part-time basis bringing very little economic stimulus to the region. The traffic is out of control in the basin with people commuting from Reno and Carson to work. I moved here 24 years ago. I have watched businesses shut down one after the other and the workforce increasingly struggling to survive in this town. It's time for Placer to start caring more about it's people and the long term goal of town vitality rather than catering to a handful of elites. Please say "NO" to this plan. Bring us more tourist accommodations so we can have homes and quality of life for the workers that sustain our local economy.</p>

Attach a document

Field not completed.

Email not displaying correctly? [View it in your browser.](#)

Sue Colbert

From: Jerome Barulich <j.barulich@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Tuesday, May 26, 2020 9:51 PM
To: Sue Colbert; Heather Beckman
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Laulima Lakeside Project PLN17-00247

Dear Ms. Colbert:

Please pass along my comments against the above project to the Placer Planning Commissioners for the 5-28-20 meeting -

As a resident of Tahoe Vista, I am against a "mixed use" project that is 90% residential, and 10% commercial, to be allowed in the center of Kings Beach.

The plan for a 9-1 residential/commercial project does little for the town. Kings Beach is one of the last unique communities on the North Shore. It has a feel unto itself, contributed to by the many local businesses that make the town a bit funky, warm, and inviting. Building a 35,000 square foot private residential building on the lake side of North Lake Boulevard, including only a token amount of commercial space, destroys that feel.

Please note that I am in agreement with comments offered by the Chillemi family, and others, logically calling for amendments to the Laulima plan as proposed, to save the character and charm of Kings Beach.

Please don't allow Laulima's project to do to Kings Beach what Tonopalo did to Tahoe Vista.

Thank you for your consideration.

Respectfully,

Jerome Barulich
229 Laurel Drive
PO Box 31
Tahoe Vista, CA 96148
530-546-3745

Kara Conklin

From: noreply@civicplus.com
Sent: Sunday, May 24, 2020 11:43 AM
To: Shirlee Herrington; Kara Conklin; Sue Colbert; Meghan Schwartz; Lisa Carnahan
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Online Form Submittal: Public Comment Submission - Planning Commission

Public Comment Submission - Planning Commission

During the Covid-19 Pandemic, Placer County is committed to public participation in County Government in a manner that is consistent with guidance provided by our Public Health Official. We have provided this form that can be used to submit comments to the Planning Commission.

First and Last Name	Elaine Bernardo
Email Address (Optional)	Ebern1824@gmail.com
Agenda Item (Optional)	Kings Beach
Comments	I am opposed to the project proposal for Kings Beach. It will ruin our small town atmosphere. We don't need private residences on the beach that will turn into AirBnB's. We need retail shops , restaurants on the beach ,picnic areas. This lake is for all to enjoy not for a few privileged that probably won't even live here and be a part of our community. It's said you on the board will do what you want anyway please prove the locals wrong !
Attach a document	<i>Field not completed.</i>

Email not displaying correctly? [View it in your browser.](#)

Kara Conklin

From: noreply@civicplus.com
Sent: Monday, May 25, 2020 9:25 AM
To: Shirlee Herrington; Kara Conklin; Sue Colbert; Meghan Schwartz; Lisa Carnahan
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Online Form Submittal: Public Comment Submission - Planning Commission

Public Comment Submission - Planning Commission

During the Covid-19 Pandemic, Placer County is committed to public participation in County Government in a manner that is consistent with guidance provided by our Public Health Official. We have provided this form that can be used to submit comments to the Planning Commission.

First and Last Name	Alli Berry
Email Address (Optional)	allig12@hotmail.com
Agenda Item (Optional)	Kings Beach Residential and Shore Club
Comments	I am not opposed to development, but I am opposed to this project. This is not the mixed use project that is supposed to occupy that part of town. The tiny bit of retail does not in any way make up for the fact that this plan violates the 2017 Tahoe Basin Area Plan by allowing single family residences along North Shore Boulevard. Please consider the community that is here and do not approve this plan as is. Thank you.
Attach a document	<i>Field not completed.</i>

Email not displaying correctly? [View it in your browser.](#)

Sue Colbert

From: Alan Bleiweiss <alanb@alanbleiweiss.com>
Sent: Monday, May 25, 2020 5:17 PM
To: Sue Colbert
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Laulima at Kings Beach

Since the meeting tomorrow will not be open to public participation, there is only one choice you have regarding the Laulima at Kings Beach project. Reject it. It violates our community's needs, resident's desires and true mixed use goals. We don't need condominiums right on our pristine beach. We need better resources, for residents and vacationers that don't involved AirBnB insanity. Please. Do the right thing.

As a year round residential home owner in the Kings Beach grid, I implore you to do the right thing.

Thank you.

--

Alan Bleiweiss
Forensic SEO Consultant
<https://AlanBleiweiss.com>

Kara Conklin

From: noreply@civicplus.com
Sent: Sunday, May 24, 2020 2:14 PM
To: Shirlee Herrington; Kara Conklin; Sue Colbert; Meghan Schwartz; Lisa Carnahan
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Online Form Submittal: Public Comment Submission - Planning Commission

Public Comment Submission - Planning Commission

During the Covid-19 Pandemic, Placer County is committed to public participation in County Government in a manner that is consistent with guidance provided by our Public Health Official. We have provided this form that can be used to submit comments to the Planning Commission.

First and Last Name	Alan Bleiweiss
Email Address (Optional)	alanb@alanbleiweiss.com
Agenda Item (Optional)	Laulima Development's proposed Lakeside Redevelopment Project
Comments	<p>As a full time year round resident of Kings Beach, I oppose the Laulima Lakeside Redevelopment plan as it currently exists. Before buying a home here, I vacationed in North Lake Tahoe several times over fifteen years. When I moved here, I stayed at the Ferrari while awaiting my house purchase closing date. To think we'll be losing hotel options for visitors in order to satisfy the ego of a few who might want to own a home right on the lake, is tragic. I moved here as a permanent resident because of the serene beauty of the lake, the town and the community residents. I seriously oppose residential units being allowed to be built at the lake. I seriously oppose the dramatic lack of balance in this claimed mixed use scenario. Don't succumb to the greed or the arrogance.</p>
Attach a document	<i>Field not completed.</i>

Email not displaying correctly? [View it in your browser.](#)

Kara Conklin

From: noreply@civicplus.com
Sent: Tuesday, May 26, 2020 10:52 AM
To: Kara Conklin; Sue Colbert
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Online Form Submittal: Public Comment Submission - Planning Commission

Public Comment Submission - Planning Commission

During the Covid-19 Pandemic, Placer County is committed to public participation in County Government in a manner that is consistent with guidance provided by our Public Health Official. We have provided this form that can be used to submit comments to the Planning Commission.

First and Last Name	Laura Buckner
Email Address (Optional)	laura.j.buckner@gmail.com
Agenda Item (Optional)	Opposition to Kings Beach Residential and Shore Club
Comments	I would like to share my opposition to the proposed Kings Beach Residential and Shore Club. This area should be developed for the public good to support the local economy and provide public access to beaches and amenities, NOT to build yet another exclusive area that is only accessible to owners, who will likely not be full-time residents. I believe this development would set a dangerous precedent for future developments along North Lake Boulevard, also.
Attach a document	<i>Field not completed.</i>

Email not displaying correctly? [View it in your browser.](#)

From: noreply@civicplus.com
Sent: Sunday, May 24, 2020 10:09 AM
To: Shirlee Herrington; Kara Conklin; Sue Colbert; Meghan Schwartz; Lisa Carnahan
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Online Form Submittal: Public Comment Submission - Planning Commission

Public Comment Submission - Planning Commission

During the Covid-19 Pandemic, Placer County is committed to public participation in County Government in a manner that is consistent with guidance provided by our Public Health Official. We have provided this form that can be used to submit comments to the Planning Commission.

First and Last Name	Thomas Burt
Email Address (Optional)	tomburt@winterstick.com
Agenda Item (Optional)	LAKE SIDE REDEVELOPMENT (FORMALLY KNOWN AS LAULIMA) VESTING TENTATIVE SUBDIVISION MAP, CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT, VARIANCE, AND ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW PERMIT (PLN17-00247)
Comments	<p>To the commission; I am a 4th generation resident of the Kings Beach area. I grew up in the first house built in the area.</p> <p>This is in regards to Laulima Development's proposed Lakeside Redevelopment Project. I strongly oppose the current project. Reason one: The turning of 92 rental units into 10 residential units. This is a huge loss of revenue for our county on the tax side, losing transient tax, and It violates the 2017 Tahoe Basin Area Plan vision, efforts of the North Shore community. The Area Plan's Land Use Regulations state: "New single family and secondary dwellings are not allowed along North Lake Boulevard." The team understood this policy meant these structures are prohibited along North Lake Boulevard through to the lake's edge. It is also a complete switch from the original plan of a hotel on the beach side and housing on the north side.</p> <p>Reason number two is the loss of jobs. Should a project slated to be an improvement to a community produce less jobs. Here is their words from their employee housing requirement: "The three existing hotel/motel properties have a total of 92 units (Crown 39, Gold Crest 26, and Falcon 27) that generates a total of 15.18 Full Time Equal Employees (FTEE) and the</p>

proposed project of ten residential units with amenities and commercial square footage of 3,645 square feet generates 10.30 FTEE. Placer County General Plan Section 2.C-2 states that new projects in the Lake Tahoe area are to provide for employee housing equal to at least 50 percent of the housing demand generated by the project. Therefore, the proposed project does not increase the employee population and in fact decreases the number of employees relative to the baseline number of FTEE generated by the existing uses. If the Planning Commission chooses to approve the project, all existing or previous hotel/motel generated FTEE will be credited to the new project. " So they want to get credited on their project for loss of jobs to our community?

Reason number three: The event center contract with the North Tahoe PUD was terminated in 2017 due to Laulima's inability to satisfy obligations. So again our community gets left out but the project now tries to go around it.

I believe the current form of the project does improve our community in the ways the project originally could have. It should not get approval by the commission.

Thank you for your time

Tom Burt

Attach a document

Field not completed.

Email not displaying correctly? [View it in your browser.](#)

May 22, 2020

ATT: Sue Colbert, Senior Board/Commission Clerk
Community Development Resource Agency
Planning Services Division – County of Placer
3091 County Center Drive, Suite 190
Auburn, California 95603

RE: Lakeside Redevelopment Project #PLN17-00247

ATT: Planning Commissioners

I am a Kings Beach property owner since 1982 and a member of the Kings Beach Area Plan team. I want to present my views on the Laulima proposal, which appears before the Planning Commission for a second time.

Community planners credit mixed use zoning as the best form of land development to rejuvenate an aging town center. The benefits of mixed use buildings and properties include the following:

- Increased home affordability, through lower land and construction costs
- Reduced traffic and air pollution by allowing residents to drive less
- Expanded walkability in convenient, pedestrian friendly and bikeable neighborhoods.

These benefits, along with many more, were important considerations before the Kings Beach Area Team selected mixed use zoning for the Kings Beach town center.

Laulima's proposal, however, fails to address any of these benefits. Nor does Laulima's proposal provide any economic, recreational or cultural benefit to the community.

Laulima's plan is all about building six private single family homes and two duplexes with an adjacent private amenities center serving the owners. Two token retail stores of approximately 750 square feet each and a 2100 square foot restaurant complete the proposal.

Altogether, these structures total more than 35,000 square feet, but 89.7 percent is allotted to residential housing. This is a 9-1 ratio in favor of residential use.

When the team wrote the Kings Beach Area Plan over a 2 ½ year span, we figured local government was inclined to follow other communities around the Lake that allowed private residences and associations to block visibility and access to the Lake for their own exclusivity and enjoyment. We included a "Checks and Balances" clause, so to speak, as a deterrent to lopsided residential plans, such as this.

We divided the Kings Beach town center into Lakeside and Mountainside with North Lake Blvd. as the divider. Lakeside was defined as all property between the water's edge and North Lake Boulevard. Lakeside would allow all forms of mixed use zoning, including residential. However, **Residential, was intended to be the smallest percentage and not greater than any other use. For instance, if there were 3 land uses, such as residential, retail and industrial, residential would not be greater than 33 1/3 percent on the Lakeside. Mountainside would allow all mixed use zoning without a restriction on residential use and was to be the biggest percentage.**

Clearly, Laulima's proposal is outside the boundaries of the Kings Beach Area Team's Plan. At least, the one we as a team wrote!

Sincerely,

Joseph A. (Jack) Chillemi
8819 Cutthroat Avenue
Post Office Box 1546
Kings Beach, CA 96143-1546
Telephone: 540/546-3911
Email: j@chillemi.com

Sue Colbert

From: Catherine Colburn <CColburn@ntpud.org>
Sent: Tuesday, May 26, 2020 8:48 AM
To: Sue Colbert
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Laulima lakefront Kings Beach

Dear Sir or Madam,

As a 2nd generation Kings Beach resident, I urge you to consider the long term effects of more condos on our beach. While I don't remember and you may not either, Kings Beach was once exactly what a beach side town should be, with thriving businesses and much to do along the water front. We want people to come and to have the best time ever in our little mecca by the lake, to enjoy the sun and sand and a bite to eat, in a quaint little walkable town. What we certainly do not need are more part-time residents taking ownership of the beach for their own personal enjoyment. Lake Tahoe must be available to all! Tourism is what will keep Kings Beach alive.

Please remember what the community and county agreed would be best for struggling Kings Beach. Lake front condominiums were not part of the bigger picture. Laulima new exactly what the community plan was when the lakefront motel properties were purchased. In fact we know that their original plan was to expand motel accommodations and to bring conference space to Kings Beach. While something may have changed for Laulima, nothing has changed for us, the folks who live and work in this town. We still want and need to have a thriving, friendly business district/tourist destination. A place that is beautiful now and will be for future generations to come.

Please remember the original community plan when you consider Laulima's plan to change what we all agreed would be best. Laulima wants what is best for Laulima while we all want what is best for the community at large.

Thank you.

Stay safe,
Catherine Colburn
Kings Beach, CA

DEFEND GRANITE BAY

April 27, 2020



Planning Commissioners

On behalf of our counterparts in the Tahoe area, we request a continuance on the Laulima Lakeside Redevelopment until such time that appropriate and cumulative analysis is completed. The pattern of practice of segmenting projects in violation of CEQA Guidelines § 15378(c) has become prevalent as evidenced by the other agenda item scheduled for this very hearing, Sehr Winery. Once again, we request the specific statute, ordinance or authority that allows the discretionary powers to segment this portion of the project from the Town Center thereby reducing the environmental impacts and lessening the mitigation measures required.

Good faith was not extended by the developer in offering inadequate opportunities for community input and failure to provide plans for the Town Center. It can be fairly argued that the number of Luxury Townhomes in Tahoe far exceeds the number of needed hotel units along the lake front. A hotel would provide far greater benefit to the community.

The Tahoe Lake front is a renowned destination known for its crystal-clear waters and ambience. The Planning Commission should work diligently to preserve a rare gem within Placer County.

Thank you for considering our comments

The Defend Granite Bay Board and members

• • •

Kara Conklin

From: noreply@civicplus.com
Sent: Thursday, May 21, 2020 4:08 PM
To: Shirlee Herrington; Kara Conklin; Sue Colbert; Meghan Schwartz; Lisa Carnahan
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Online Form Submittal: Public Comment Submission - Planning Commission

Public Comment Submission - Planning Commission

During the Covid-19 Pandemic, Placer County is committed to public participation in County Government in a manner that is consistent with guidance provided by our Public Health Official. We have provided this form that can be used to submit comments to the Planning Commission.

First and Last Name	Theresa May Duggan
Email Address (Optional)	teemayduggan@gmail.com
Agenda Item (Optional)	Laulima Kings Beach, aka Lakeside Redevelopment
Comments	See attached document
Attach a document	May 2020 Comments for Placer County Planning Commission July 25.docx

Email not displaying correctly? [View it in your browser.](#)

My name is Theresa May Duggan. I've lived in here since 1977. I served as a staff person on the Pathways 2007 process, participated in the Vision Charette, 2013 and as a member of the North Tahoe East team.

During Pathways, in a series of 3 workshops we studied 1) the existing conditions, 2) alternative futures 3) implementation of good ideas.

In August 2006 the Pathways process released a Vision Summary. It's clear we want to "reinvest in and revitalize existing centers, and realize environmental gains."

Our town centers were "envisioned as mixed-use places with visitor accommodations, retail services, and recreation activities."

We defined achievable benefits with **Principles and Concepts** to support a **triple bottom line**,

the **social** benefits would

"provide workforce housing, maintain a middle class and **add gathering spaces**."

The **environmental** reinvestment would

"improve water and air quality, add green buildings and restore a degraded ecosystem."

And the **economic** benefits would

"expand visitor accommodations and economic diversification."

At the Kings Beach Charette.

Our ideas were recorded when we said "keep it funky", we're a "recreation community" and "it's about the people of Kings Beach" and specifically where this proposal is located, we asked that

"Brockway Vista is a green street".

We wanted a

“promenade along the beach” and

“create a waterfront destination to suit a wide range of visitor expectations.”

“protect lake and ridgeline views through thoughtful site design”.

Specifically,

“enhance overnight accommodations to attract longer visitors stays.”

Now let’s look at the Basin Area Plan, released with great fanfare in January 2017, (notably 2 years after CEDRA planned Spring 2015 release).

I read the documents with great anticipation. Our vision, principles and concepts put into writing. It is a dense, technical tome, as it should be, but it also allows for an interpretation of regulations.

For example, page 17 of volume 1, an amendment “allowing residential and mixed uses within the Town Center” was added and I can’t find any place where a ratio is defined. Is 90/10 allowed? Is 50/50 preferred?

On page 44 under Scenic Resources, Policy P-5 states: “Implement site and building design standards to protect and enhance scenic views. On page 98, “Require variations in building heights”. Policy P-4 states “Protect and **enhance** existing scenic views and vistas.

The wall of shoe box condos is not supporting the spirit of the Plan.

On page 75, Socio-Economic Policy #P-4 states

“whenever possible, Placer County should provide assistance to property owners on priority sites.”

Could that assistance include increased height to accommodate an upscale hotel?

On page 96, looking at TAUs

“Many old motels are blighted, environmentally impactful and would benefit from redevelopment.”

“The demand for improved lodging in the Plan area provides a significant redevelopment opportunity.”

And at the bottom of Page 99 we read

“The current pattern of visitors staying outside the Basin and driving in is environmentally and economically impactful.”

“there is a land use imbalance of lodging compared to visitation levels and other uses.”

We need lodging!

There are many examples showing the proposal doesn't meet the spirit/letter of the plan.

We were promised a hotel! Some ideas might include Sunnyside lite, a mini Hyatt or a Lakeside Ritz Carlton! We're ready for a great new gathering place that includes lodging, restaurant and bar.

Please allow the applicants to return with a proposal that honors the community vision and the Basin Area Plan, it can and must be done.

Thank you.



Placer County Planning Commission
3091 County Center Drive
Auburn, CA 95603
scolbert@placer.ca.gov

May 22, 2020

Subject: Mitigated Negative Declaration for Lakeside Redevelopment (PLN17-00047)

Dear Members of the Placer County Planning Commission:

The Friends of the West Shore appreciates this opportunity to provide comments for your consideration of the Mitigated Negative Declaration for the Lakeside Redevelopment Project (Proposed Project). The Friends of the West Shore (FOWS) works toward the preservation, protection, and conservation of the West Shore, our watersheds, wildlife, and rural quality of life, for today and future generations. FOWS represents community interests from south of Tahoe City to Emerald Bay.

We are disappointed that no changes have been made to address the extensive concerns expressed by the public last July. We do not believe that the one public meeting held in January where the applicant defended the project qualifies as the “adequate public **involvement and engagement**” you agreed was missing last July.¹ Since no changes have been made, we are re-submitting the comments we sent on 7/19/2019.

We ask you to uphold the recommendation of the North Tahoe Regional Advisory Council to recommend denial of the Proposed Project at this time. The Proposed Project should be revised to conform to the intent and implementing regulations within the Tahoe Basin Area Plan, followed by a full environmental analysis based on a complete project description and disclosure to the public.

Please feel free to contact Jennifer Quashnick at jqtahoe@sbcglobal.net if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Judith Tornese,
President

Cc: Allen Breuch, Planning Supervisor, Community Development Resource Agency-Tahoe

¹ “The Planning Commission had similar concerns about the project and also expressed concerns that the proposed project, in its current form, did not have adequate public involvement and engagement to address the mixed-use and economic development concerns. Rather than making a decision on the project, the Planning Commission directed the applicant to obtain additional public input.” (PCPC Staff Report, p. 3).



Placer County Planning Commission
3091 County Center Drive
Auburn, CA 95603
scolbert@placer.ca.gov

July 19, 2019

Subject: Mitigated Negative Declaration for Lakeside Redevelopment (PLN17-00047)

Dear Members of the Placer County Planning Commission:

The Friends of the West Shore appreciates this opportunity to provide comments for your consideration of the Mitigated Negative Declaration for the Lakeside Redevelopment Project (Proposed Project). The Friends of the West Shore (FOWS) works toward the preservation, protection, and conservation of the West Shore, our watersheds, wildlife, and rural quality of life, for today and future generations. FOWS represents community interests from Tahoma to Tahoe City.

While the Proposed Project is not located along Tahoe's West Shore, it is of concern for several reasons, as noted below.

1. We support the efforts of the North Tahoe community members to shape the future of their communities. FOWS maintained regular contact with several members on the North Tahoe East Team (NTET) during the process to develop the Tahoe Basin Area Plan and is aware of the extensive amount of time, energy, and collaboration that was undertaken by NTET members.

As documented in comments provided by several NTET members,¹ the proposed project is not in line with the adopted Tahoe Basin Area Plan (TBAP) or the community's wishes as expressed during the NTET process.

2. Second, the Proposed Project, and the County's reliance on a Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND), may set a precedent of allowing minor environmental review for Proposed Projects of this size and significance throughout the Tahoe Basin portion of Placer County.

Further, the MND lacks an adequate project description. For example, the MND does not disclose the height of the proposed buildings, yet building height (and related impacts to scenic quality and viewsheds) was a key issue of concern and negotiation throughout the TBAP development process. We also note that the proposed "mitigation" for construction noise² conflicts with TRPA's Code (Section 68.9), which only exempts construction noise between 8 a.m. and 6:30 p.m.

¹ E.g. Megan Chillemi, 6/12/2019; Ellie Waller, 6/20/2019.

² "MM XII.1. In order to mitigate the impacts of construction noise noted above, construction noise emanating from any construction activities for which a building permit or grading permit is required is prohibited on Sundays and Federal Holiday and shall only occur:

1. Monday through Friday, 6:00 am to 8:00 pm (during daylight savings)
2. Monday through Friday, 7:00 am to 8:00 pm (during standard time)
3. Saturdays, 8:00 am to 6:00 pm" (MND, p. 27)

3. Third, developments in North Lake Tahoe can affect traffic and visitation along the West Shore and contribute air and water pollution into our shared airshed and watershed.

The Proposed Project will remove 92 existing Tourist Accommodation Units (TAUs). The MND does not disclose what will be done with the TAUs; will they be banked, transferred, etc.? As one of the intents of TRPA's 2012 Regional Plan, and the 2017 Tahoe Basin Area Plan, was to locate tourist uses in pedestrian-friendly areas where visitors can "park once," we are concerned about where the 92 TAUs may be transferred to. The existing units are located in an area where there are significant pedestrian-friendly amenities. If the TAUs are transferred somewhere else located farther away from such amenities, visitors that currently park once and walk may instead have to drive from the new location, creating more traffic and the associated pollution and public safety impacts.

We ask you to uphold the recommendation of the North Tahoe Regional Advisory Council to recommend denial of the Proposed Project at this time. The Proposed Project should be revised to conform to the intent and implementing regulations within the Tahoe Basin Area Plan, followed by a full environmental analysis based on a complete project description and disclosure to the public.

Please feel free to contact Jennifer Quashnick at jqtahoe@sbcglobal.net if you have any questions.

Sincerely,



Judith Tornese,
President

Cc: Allen Breuch, Planning Supervisor, Community Development Resource Agency-Tahoe

To: Placer County Planning Commission

From: Property Owners on Brockway Vista (adjacent to proposed project)

Re: Laulima Lakeside Development

Date: 5-27-20

To whom it may concern:

We, the 10 owners of two of the beachfront properties on Brockway Vista west of the proposed development want to fully endorse the Laulima project as proposed with the exception of Item 53 I relating to the irrevocable easement on the lakeside of the development.

The development as proposed will provide attractive residential units as well as other commercial and community spaces and structures which will lead to a well-balanced overall development. The addition of the residential units, in particular, will lead to a better balance along the two segments of Brockway Vista flanking either side of the public beach.

The property is private property and appears to have met all the requirements of the various governing jurisdictions, and therefor should be allowed to proceed.

While we recognize the need to receive community input, we strongly support greater consideration and weight for the property owners immediately and directly adjacent to the proposed project. Comments from individuals not directly impacted by the project, and in many cases, non-residents of Kings Beach, shouldn't be dismissed, but quite frankly should have little bearing on this project.

Regarding the irrevocable easement. It is not necessary and only further complicates what already exists. Anyone is welcome to walk on the lakeside of the high water mark anywhere around the lake. However, there is already enough incursion into and onto private property as it is. The creation of easements will only lead to further trespassing violations and worse. The bisection of the beach by any future walkway will invariably lead to "cross traffic" collisions between little children and joggers, runners, and cyclists. Most importantly, there isn't room. Easements and walkways proposed to Secline would have to be located in such a way that when the lake is full, the walkway would be almost 18" under water at certain points. Please remove this item.

Once again we want the commissioners to realize that we, the immediate neighbors, property owners and Kings beach residents since 1929, strongly support this development.

Respectfully,

The Falconer, Gordon, Anderson, and Bousley Families
8096 and 8106 Brockway Vista, Kings Beach

Sue Colbert

From: Tom Gordon <tomgordon@teamfitness.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 27, 2020 3:12 PM
To: Sue Colbert; Heather Beckman
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Laulima Input - Brockway Vista Residents
Attachments: Letter to the Commissioners - Community Development Resource Agency.docx

Hi Sue and Heather,

I enclose this letter representing and with permission from all the various owners of our two residences at 8096 and 8106 Brockway Vista. Our two parcels are two parcels away from the development, and our stretch of Brockway Vista is the section that is to be improved as it connects to Secline.

Please make sure this letter is read by all the commissioners. We feel very strongly that residents immediately affected and adjacent to the development should have their comments weighted much more substantially than those in other areas of the town not directly affected, or even those from out of town and/or out of state.

Thanks for your time.

Respectfully,

Tom Gordon on behalf of the Falconer, Anderson, Gordon, and Bousley families

(877) 7510-5100

tomgordon@teamfitness.com

8096 Brockway Vista, Kings Beach

Sue Colbert

From: Ron Grassi <ronsallygrassi@mac.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 27, 2020 5:08 PM
To: Sue Colbert
Cc: Ann Nichols; Judy and Jerry Winters; Ellie Ellie
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Laulima

Dear Ms. Colbert: I am opposed to this project. I'm not surprised that Placer is again giving in to residential development for wealthy part time residents. Placer and TRPA before you, have been on a push for years to privatize the beaches and views so that a privileged few can benefit. I am hoping a grassroots organization and law firm come forward to whom I will gladly donate my money and time. You need to consider the public and its already established legal right to the Lake's beaches. I can't stomach what you're doing so blatantly. I oppose your latest capitulation.

Ron Grassi, Esq. retired
Tahoe City resident-45 years

ps if you contend you are actually in the corner of the common resident and tourist as opposed to the developers intent on making a buck, please tell me how Sandy Beach campground is coming. I recall the speeches made by the planning department at the time: don't worry we'll find a new campground. Where is it?

MAY 20 2020

CDRA

5-17-2020

To whom it may Concern:

I am contacting Placer County Commission Clerk regarding the Laulima Lakeside Redevelopment Project.

I am a 60 yr. resident of Kings Beach and very proud of having the privilege of being able to say that there is no other place that I would live.

The fact that anyone would approve or even consider the Laulima Project is beyond me and many other people in Kings Beach.

To permit anyone to take away our beach, the beauty of Lake Tahoe, is beyond me.

Please, before, you even consider this ridiculous plan, do something for our residents.

Laulima has no interest in the area, except to walk out of our area, with a load of money.

You board members are on the Board, because of us property owners, so please stop this project. We are relying on you !!

Sincerely,

June Landreville@yahco.com June Landreville

Sue Colbert

From: Heather Beckman
Sent: Tuesday, May 26, 2020 6:06 AM
To: Margaret Martini
Cc: Sue Colbert
Subject: RE: [EXTERNAL] Laulima Project.

Thank you Margaret. I'll make sure that your comment is entered into the official record and provided to the Planning Commission

Heather Beckman
County of Placer - Community Development Resource Agency
(530) 581-6286 / hbeckman@placer.ca.gov

From: Margaret Martini <margaretmartini@liveintahoe.com>
Sent: Saturday, May 23, 2020 3:01 PM
To: Heather Beckman <HBeckman@placer.ca.gov>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Laulima Project.

Hello,

I would like to voice my distress at the way the Laulima project has morphed.

If they cannot do the original, then they need to step back and regroup with a plan close to the original project and not try to change for a huge benefit to the developers and the detriment of the residents of Kings Beach.

There are in place community plans and the county needs to review them and act accordingly. The switch is inappropriate and devious.

Thank you,

Margaret Martini

Lake Tahoe resident 30 years

Sue Colbert

From: Carolyn Myrmel <cmyrmel@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 27, 2020 4:37 PM
To: Sue Colbert; Heather Beckman; Cindy Gustafson
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Lulima Project, Brockway Vista Ave, Kings Beach
Attachments: Lulima our house.docx

To: Placer County Planning Commission

From: Carolyn Myrmel cmyrmel@yahoo.com

Sue Colbert <SColbert@placer.ca.gov>; Heather Beckman <HBeckman@placer.ca.gov>; Cindy Gustafson <cindygustafson@placer.ca.gov>

05/27/20

Carolyn & Robert Myrmel are in support of the Lulima Project with the exception of Item 53.1, (public access walkway easement).

Brockway Vista Ave, Kings Beach, CA 96143

We have owned our personal, full time home since 1987. We have raised our three daughters in our home as well. We live next to Ferrari's Crown Resort the entire 33 years.

Please take into consideration all of the homeowners on Brockway Vista Avenue in your final decisions. We are all private home owners and Lulima is also already private. The Falcon Motel is an eye sore to all visitors and locals seen on Highway 28 and it needs to be torn down. The Gold Crest was acquired many years ago by Ferrari's Crown and it is also in need of a major ADA, A/C and many other upgrades. The Crown is also as old and in need of repairs.

The Lulima Project will beautify the main highway/corridor. A hotel on the opposite main highway will be the future for a modern and updated solution.

Again, please consider our quiet, local street homeowners and look to the future better use of our land.

Sincerely,

Carolyn Myrmel

cmyrmel@yahoo.com

8144 Brockway Vista Ave.

Kings Beach, CA

To: Placer County Planning Commission

From: Carolyn Myrmel cmyrmel@yahoo.com

Sue Colbert <SColbert@placer.ca.gov>; Heather Beckman <HBeckman@placer.ca.gov>; Cindy Gustafson <cindygustafson@placer.ca.gov>

05/27/20

Carolyn & Robert Myrmel are in support of the Laulima Project with the exception of Item 53.1, (public access walkway easement).

Brockway Vista Ave, Kings Beach, CA 96143

We have owned our personal, full time home since 1987. We have raised our three daughters in our home as well. We live next to Ferrari's Crown Resort the entire 33 years.

Please take into consideration all of the homeowners on Brockway Vista Avenue in your final decisions. We are all private home owners and Laulima is also already private. The Falcon Motel is an eye sore to all visitors and locals seen on Highway 28 and it needs to be torn down. The Gold Crest was acquired many years ago by Ferrari's Crown and it is also in need of a major ADA, A/C and many other upgrades. The Crown is also as old and in need of repairs.

The Laulima Project will beautify the main highway/corridor. A hotel on the opposite main highway will be the future for a modern and updated solution.

Again, please consider our quiet, local street homeowners and look to the future better use of our land.

Sincerely,

Carolyn Myrmel
cmyrmel@yahoo.com
8144 Brockway Vista Ave.
Kings Beach, CA

Sue Colbert

From: Debi Langston Nicholls <wolfdebi@icloud.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 27, 2020 3:15 PM
To: Sue Colbert; Heather Beckman; Cindy Gustafson
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Laulima Project, May 28, 2020

Sue Colbert
Senior Board/Commission Clerk
Placer County

We are in Support of the Laulima Project.

We are adjacent property owners who have owned our property for over 30 years. Property owners who are in the immediate vicinity and or adjacent to this project are definitely impacted the most. Although the community's input should be considered, ultimately it will be the adjacent property owners who will live with the final development 24 hours a day. When the rest of the community goes home at night, we are left to deal with how the development effects our lives.

We are requesting that more consideration be given to the properties that are impacted the most by the adjacent development.

We are in favor of the Laulima Development as submitted by the County Departments. The County is requiring a public access walkway through the center of the project. We are opposed to Condition 53.I

Please forward this correspondence to the Commissioners to be considered prior to their voting.

Respectively submitted,

Debi Langston
8246 Brockway Vista
Kings Beach, CA 96143

Sent from my iPhone

Sue Colbert

From: ann@annnichols.com
Sent: Monday, May 25, 2020 11:57 AM
To: preserve@ntpac.com; Sue Colbert; Megan Wood; Placer County Board of Supervisors
Cc: Heather Beckman; Steve Buelna; EJ Ivaldi; Todd Leopold
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Comments for the May 28, 2020 Planning Commission

Please accept these comments for the record for the proposed Lakeside Redevelopment project (Laulima luxury condos)

Laulima Lakeside Project is Just More Luxury Condos

As a member of the Kings Beach Community Plan Team, luxury condos fly in the face of what the community and the County wanted for economically struggling Kings Beach. This is not redevelopment, it is Condominium-izing Kings Beach.

10 Luxury residential condos are not an allowed use...it requires a conditional use permit. Public outcry against the idea has generated nearly 2000 petition signatures.

Yet the Laulima project still proposes the same project that has been turned down over the last two years. Nothing has changed.

The proposal is located on the LAST lakefront parcel that would allow a lakefront hotel or tourist use. That's what Kings Beach needs-not more luxury condos.

The applicants piecemeal planning refuses to disclose what will happen to the 92 tourist accommodation units from the Falcon Lodge, Gold Crest Motel and the Ferrari Crown Motel. The developer might sell them to another town at Tahoe. This is an incalculable loss to Kings Beach.

Please email your comments TODAY to scolbert@placer.ca.gov.

The hearing is at 10:05 Tuesday 5/26/20. Due to Covid there will not be a public meeting.

Thank you

Ann Nichols

Sue Colbert

From: preserve@ntpac.com
Sent: Monday, May 25, 2020 11:54 AM
To: Sue Colbert; Megan Wood; Placer County Board of Supervisors
Cc: Heather Beckman; Steve Buelna; EJ Ivaldi; Todd Leopold
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Comments for the May 28, 2020 Planning Commission

Please accept these comments for the record for the proposed Lakeside Redevelopment project (Laulima luxury condos)

Laulima Lakeside Project is Just More Luxury Condos

As a member of the Kings Beach Community Plan Team, luxury condos fly in the face of what the community and the County wanted for economically struggling Kings Beach. This is not redevelopment, it is Condominium-izing Kings Beach.

10 Luxury residential condos are not an allowed use...it requires a conditional use permit. Public outcry against the idea has generated nearly 2000 petition signatures.

Yet the Laulima project still proposes the same project that has been turned down over the last two years. Nothing has changed.

The proposal is located on the LAST lakefront parcel that would allow a lakefront hotel or tourist use. That's what Kings Beach needs-not more luxury condos.

The applicants piecemeal planning refuses to disclose what will happen to the 92 tourist accommodation units from the Falcon Lodge, Gold Crest Motel and the Ferrari Crown Motel. The developer might sell them to another town at Tahoe. This is an incalculable loss to Kings Beach.

Please email your comments TODAY to scolbert@placer.ca.gov.

The hearing is at 10:05 Tuesday 5/26/20. Due to Covid there will not be a public meeting.

Thank you

Sue Colbert

From: noreply@civicplus.com
Sent: Tuesday, May 26, 2020 7:05 AM
To: Shirlee Herrington; Kara Conklin; Sue Colbert; Meghan Schwartz; Lisa Carnahan
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Online Form Submittal: Public Comment Submission - Planning Commission

Public Comment Submission - Planning Commission

During the Covid-19 Pandemic, Placer County is committed to public participation in County Government in a manner that is consistent with guidance provided by our Public Health Official. We have provided this form that can be used to submit comments to the Planning Commission.

First and Last Name	Scott Shane
Email Address (Optional)	muttlemier@yahoo.com
Agenda Item (Optional)	North Tahoe Laulima
Comments	<p>The Laulima property should be developed as a public, for all, use space as originally planned, and not private , for the few. It would be a shame to see a few wealthy privileged get there private lakefront property that there is too much of anyway. This mistake has been made time and time again through the years as Tahoe has been developed. Have we not learned anything and are we not progressing in a smart way. Let's not make this mistake yet again. The lakefront needs to be public and the private residence need to be on the north side of the street.</p> <p>Thank you.</p> <p>Scott Shane, 22 year Kings Beach non lakefront resident.</p>
Attach a document	<i>Field not completed.</i>

Email not displaying correctly? [View it in your browser.](#)

Sue Colbert

From: Charles Soule <thesoule@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Tuesday, May 26, 2020 9:58 AM
To: Sue Colbert
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Laulima

Hi there

We are Kings Beach business owners and also two property owners, and residents for 50 years myself.
We are against the proposed Laulima project unless it includes motel /hotel rooms and employee housing
Thank you
Charlie and Rachelle Soule

Kara Conklin

From: noreply@civicplus.com
Sent: Sunday, May 24, 2020 11:17 AM
To: Shirlee Herrington; Kara Conklin; Sue Colbert; Meghan Schwartz; Lisa Carnahan
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Online Form Submittal: Public Comment Submission - Planning Commission

Public Comment Submission - Planning Commission

During the Covid-19 Pandemic, Placer County is committed to public participation in County Government in a manner that is consistent with guidance provided by our Public Health Official. We have provided this form that can be used to submit comments to the Planning Commission.

First and Last Name	Joe Taylor
Email Address (Optional)	Joegingles@gmail.com
Agenda Item (Optional)	Laulima development in Kings beach
Comments	<p>I am writing to oppose the current proposal for luxury residential properties at the site off the Ferrari crown, the falcon and other. This project does not serve the community, and is not living up to the promises it had made. We do not need more luxury condos in Kings beach that are just going to sit empty for most of the year! We need a true mixed use of affordable housing and public services that will expand the options for residence living at the lake full time. If they build private condos on the lake side, we will likely lose access to the beach in that area. Keep Kong's beach public please.</p> <p>Why is the rule for not building new residential on the lake being enforced?</p> <p>Sincerely, Joe Taylor Homeowner</p>
Attach a document	<i>Field not completed.</i>

Email not displaying correctly? [View it in your browser.](#)

Sue Colbert

From: jmtornese@aol.com
Sent: Wednesday, May 27, 2020 4:20 PM
To: Heather Beckman; Sue Colbert
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Laulima Project - Planning Meeting

To: Sue Colbert and Heather Beckman

Please forward these comments to the Planning Commission members.

We are opposed to the Lakeshore redevelopment formally known as Laulima. The concerns of the public are not being considered at all. The applicant is proposing the same project - nothing has changed from last [July.to](#) consider community concerns. This is so disingenuous to the public. We are very concerned that the last beachfront property in Kings Beach will not have any public access. More & more visitors are coming to Tahoe in the summer and they need to be accommodated. **We need more beaches!!** Please consider the needs of locals & visitors when making your decision. At a minimum, it would be very simple to have a portion of the beach allotted to the public, just like they did at Chambers Landing on the West Shore. **Tahoe beaches should be entirely open to everyone!**

Sincerely,
Judith Tornese and Jerry Winters
Tahoma, Ca.

Sue Colbert

From: Ellie <tahoellie@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 20, 2020 4:24 PM
To: Sue Colbert
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Fw: Who is running the Laulima meeting on January 28

Sue,
PLEASE forward to Planning Commissioners.

WE DID NOT HAVE A WORKSHOP????

Respectfully, Ellie Waller

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: EJ Ivaldi <ejivaldi@placer.ca.gov>
To: Ellie <tahoellie@yahoo.com>
Cc: Todd Leopold <TLeopold@placer.ca.gov>; Jennifer Merchant <JMerchan@placer.ca.gov>; Cindy Gustafson <cindygustafson@placer.ca.gov>; Lindsay Romack <LRomack@placer.ca.gov>; Steve Pedretti <SPedretti@placer.ca.gov>; Heather Beckman <HBeckman@placer.ca.gov>
Sent: Friday, January 24, 2020, 4:23:46 PM PST
Subject: RE: Who is running the Laulima meeting on January 28

Hi Ellie,

The Developer is holding the January 28th community meeting at the Kings Beach Event Center. Planning staff will be present and Heather Beckman is now the project lead with Allen's retirement last year.

You should know that the Planning Commission will hold a “workshop” at an upcoming Planning Commission meeting as well. We will be sure to provide adequate notice to the public. After such time, the project will be brought back to the Planning Commission for its consideration.

Please let me know if you have any further questions.

Thank you!

E.J. Ivaldi

Planning Director

Placer County Planning Services Division

3091 County Center Drive, Suite 140

Auburn, CA 95603

530-745-3147

530-745-3080 (FAX)

ejivaldi@placer.ca.gov

From: Ellie [mailto:tahoellie@yahoo.com]

Sent: Friday, January 24, 2020 3:13 PM

To: Steve Pedretti <SPedretti@placer.ca.gov>; EJ Ivaldi <EJlvaldi@placer.ca.gov>

Cc: Todd Leopold <TLeopold@placer.ca.gov>; Jennifer Merchant <JMerchan@placer.ca.gov>; Cindy Gustafson <cindygustafson@placer.ca.gov>; Lindsay Romack <LRomack@placer.ca.gov>

Subject: Who is running the Laulima meeting on January 28

Is this a Placer County meeting or just the developer meeting with the public?

Will County staff be in attendance?

Has a new Placer Staff person been assigned to this project?

Thank you in advance for answers before the January 28 meeting. ~Ellie Waller

Sue Colbert

From: Ellie <tahoellie@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 20, 2020 4:30 PM
To: Sue Colbert
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Fw: Further Clarification Requested: March 19 at 10:30a Planning Commission at the No Tahoe Event Center Laulima Lakeside Redevelopment

Please send this to the Commissioners. Thank you

I do not agree with the staff assessment as we are entitled to that workshop. The applicant was directed to have a workshop to find even ground with the community on the proposed site. The Jan 28 meeting did not result in any real compromise or solution.

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: EJ Ivaldi <ejivaldi@placer.ca.gov>
To: Ellie <tahoellie@yahoo.com>
Cc: Cindy Gustafson <cindygustafson@placer.ca.gov>; Lindsay Romack <LRomack@placer.ca.gov>; Jennifer Merchant <JMerchan@placer.ca.gov>; Erin Casey <ECasey@placer.ca.gov>; Todd Leopold <TLeopold@placer.ca.gov>; Sue Colbert <SColbert@placer.ca.gov>; Megan Wood <MWood@placer.ca.gov>; Karin Schwab <KSchwab@placer.ca.gov>; Clayton Cook <CCook@placer.ca.gov>; Steve Pedretti <SPedretti@placer.ca.gov>; Heather Beckman <HBeckman@placer.ca.gov>
Sent: Friday, March 6, 2020, 12:08:43 PM PST
Subject: RE: Further Clarification Requested: March 19 at 10:30a Planning Commission at the No Tahoe Event Center Laulima Lakeside Redevelopment

Hi Ellie,

The action taken by the Planning Commission on July 25, 2019 was to continue the item to an open date in order for the applicant to obtain additional public input, but did not contain requirements as to how the public outreach must occur. The applicant was asked by staff to conduct additional public outreach and to obtain additional public input in accordance with that direction. The applicant and staff considered a potential workshop with the Planning Commission, and at one point that was part of the plan. Ultimately though, the applicant elected to perform the outreach through a public workshop that it held on January 28th at the Kings Beach Event Center instead, which meets the Planning Commission's direction.

The upcoming Planning Commission meeting in Tahoe is scheduled for March 19th at the Kings Beach Event Center and starts at 10:00 am. The Lakeside Redevelopment project item is timed and will begin no earlier than 10:30 am.

E.J. Ivaldi

Planning Director

Placer County Planning Services Division

3091 County Center Drive, Suite 140

Auburn, CA 95603

530-745-3147

530-745-3080 (FAX)

ejivaldi@placer.ca.gov

From: Ellie <tahoellie@yahoo.com>

Date: March 5, 2020 at 9:47:31 PM PST

To: Heather Beckman <HBeckman@placer.ca.gov>

Cc: Cindy Gustafson <cindygustafson@placer.ca.gov>, Lindsay Romack <LRomack@placer.ca.gov>, Jennifer Merchant <JMerchan@placer.ca.gov>, Erin Casey <ERCasey@placer.ca.gov>, Todd Leopold <TLeopold@placer.ca.gov>, Sue Colbert <SColbert@placer.ca.gov>, Megan Wood <MWood@placer.ca.gov>, Clayton Cook <CCook@placer.ca.gov>, Karin Schwab <KSchwab@placer.ca.gov>, Ann Nichols <preserve@ntpac.com>, Cris Hennessey <languageneeds1@gmail.com>, Ryan Wexler Tahoe Community <epicwinter@hotmail.com>, Mickey Lees <drmojomickey@yahoo.com>, Sue and Dan Daniels <susan.daniels@cbnorcal.com>, Scott Tieche Tahoe Community <scott@tahoescott.com>, Dana Spencer Tahoe Community <danamare@aol.com>, Jennifer Quashnick <jqtahoe@sbcglobal.net>, Carl Mielke Tahoe Community <camielke@charter.net>, Carolyn Myrmel Tahoe Community <cmyrmel@gmail.com>, Martha Cedar Glen Tahoe Community <martha@cedarglenlodge.com>, Cindy Curran Tahoe Community <cinsetter7999@sbcglobal.net>, Regina Straver Tahoe Community <straver@charter.net>, Margaret Martini <margaretmartini@liveintahoe.com>, Nora Leeder <noraleeder@me.com>, Carol and Jay Shaw Tahoe Community <drjay.s@att.net>, Emilio Vaca Tahoe Community <emiliovaca7@gmail.com>, David Stirling Tahoe Community <kingswood.tahoe@gmail.com>, Kathy Witt Tahoe Community <kathw456@gmail.com>, Don Starbard Tahoe Community <don@starbard.com>, Tim Ferrell <ferrell@ftcivil.com>, Fil Aguirre <filandkaren@gmail.com>, Mike Schwartz North Tahoe Fire <schwartz@ntfire.net>, Linda Forner Tahoe Community <meeya03@aol.com>, Daniel Flores <cindyflores353@icloud.com>, Erin Holland <holland@ntfire.net>, Robert Heinz <robertsheinz@gmail.com>, Haas Tahoe Community <bhaas050972@yahoo.com>, Julie Wainscoat <kingjohn5@charter.net>, Norm Kitching <normski@pacbell.net>, Peggy Nicholas <nicholasp@prodigy.net>, Vern and Randi Porter Tahoe Community <vernlporter@sbcglobal.net>, Laurie Stevenson Tahoe Community <lauriebs@sbcglobal.net>, Leah Kaufman <leah.lkplanning@sbcglobal.net>

Subject: Further Clarification Requested: March 19 at 10:30a Planning Commission at the No Tahoe Event Center Laulima Lakeside Redevelopment

Reply-To: Ellie <tahoellie@yahoo.com>

Heather,

I need clarification before making any further requests or comments.

I was told by Lindsay the community would get the opportunity to participate in a public **workshop** for the Laulima Lakeside proposed condo project with the Planning Commissioners before a public hearing was to occur.

At the July 25, 2019 Planning Commission hearing the Commissioners were very specific and requested that the applicant meet with the community to find some common ground if possible.

The applicants representative Brian Helm recently conducted a public meeting explaining no changes were going to be made and presented a chart on why a hotel was not financially feasible for the applicant who was not in attendance.

In receiving the recent Planning Commission agenda item (below) that the applicants representative is requesting a public hearing for approval took me by surprise as we have not had a public workshop.

Can you clarify why the applicant has decided not to conduct a workshop and is not following the directives (as clearly stated at the July 25, 2019 meeting) from the Planning Commissioners? And why staff would support a public hearing without the workshop?

Sue, could you so kindly forward this e-mail to the Planning Commissioners. Megan, could you do the same and forward to the Board of Supervisors. Thank you for your assistance in expediency in getting to the Commissioners and Supervisors this information.

~Ellie Waller

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: Sue Colbert <scolbert@placer.ca.gov>

To: Sue Colbert <scolbert@placer.ca.gov>

Sent: Wednesday, March 4, 2020, 11:46:33 AM PST

Subject: FW: Lakeside Redevelopment (Formally known as Lulima) (PLN17-00247)

Good Morning,

Please find the attached legal notice for the project listed above, scheduled for the March 19, 2020 Planning Commission meeting.

Lists: CEQA-All Projects

CEQA Lulima, Lakeside

CEQA-Tahoe Projects

Thank you,

Sue Colbert

Senior Board / Commission Clerk

Community Development Resource Agency

Planning Services Division

3091 County Center Drive

Auburn, CA 95603

(530) 745-3113 | (530) 745-3080 fax | scolbert@placer.ca.gov

Disclaimer

The information contained in this communication from the sender is confidential. It is intended solely for use by the recipient and others authorized to receive it. If you are not the recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, distribution or taking action in relation of the contents of this information is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful.

This email has been scanned for viruses and malware, and may have been automatically archived by **Mimecast Ltd**, an innovator in Software as a Service (SaaS) for business. Providing a **safer** and **more useful** place for your human generated data. Specializing in; Security, archiving and compliance. To find out more [Click Here](#).

Ellie Waller member of the North Tahoe West Area Plan Team

I spent many years as a member of a Tahoe Basin Area Plan team and often participated with the North Tahoe East Team especially during their 3-day charette.

Transparency builds trust and this is just plain murky

This proposed bifurcated Town Center project is setting a very bad precedent. What prohibits the Clarke Group from asking for their condos first? At least they provided a Town Center plan. And of course this begs the question: Is Laulima selling off their Tourist Accommodation Units to the Clarke Group and not build their previously proposed hotel at all?

The County allowing for a Mitigated Negative Declaration for a portion of a Town Center project is piece-mealing by definition. A project is defined as the “WHOLE of an action” and MAY NOT be segmented nor divided into smaller parts in an attempt to avoid full consideration of its environmental impacts. Thus, all of the separate permits and approvals for a particular project SHALL be considered together (along with the underlying activity itself) ...The environmental review of a project MUST include an analysis of the environmental effects of future expansion....”

I frankly do not understand how staff could approve this condo request without an entire concept for a Town Center project. I completely understand that this would probably be a phased approach but not piece-mealed as being allowed by the County.

The Mitigated Neg Dec states:

Project Site(Background/Existing Setting):The project area includes seven parcels comprising 80,543 square feet (1.85 acre) and includes Lots 13 through 22 and 88 through 99, that were recorded in February 17, 1926, as part of the “Brockway Vista Subdivision”, Book D of Maps at Page 16 Blocks “A” and “B”. **The project’s seven parcels (22 lots) are currently within the Mixed-Use Lakeside Town Center, North Tahoe East District of the Tahoe Basin Area Plan and include two motel businesses, the “Gold Crest” and the “Ferrari Crown” that are currently operating, as**

well as the “Falcon Lodge” that suspended operations as a result of substandard building, and cited violations of health and safety codes. The three motel sites have a combined total of 92 motel units (20 with kitchens) and 112 surface parking spaces that are scattered at various locations on the lots and within Brockway Vista right-of-way. The three motels are housed in eight buildings totaling 38,598 square feet and built throughout the late 1950’s and early 1960’s. Some of the buildings have been renovated over the years but have not been brought up to meet current building code standards. **Over all the site is scattered with abandoned or dated buildings that degrade the overall aesthetics of the area.** North Lake Boulevard to the north of the project site has recently had **new community plan improvements** including fire hydrants, sidewalks, landscaping and paving along the right-of-way....

Why should the developer benefit from the new community plan improvements in Kings Beach without providing a plan for a Town Center Project?

Following demolition of the existing dilapidated structures, the proposed project would construct three commercial buildings, six single-family residences, and two duplexes (totaling 10 residential units) for a total of 13 new structures.

Why hasn’t demolition, in good faith, occurred? The Mitigated Neg Dec comment period closed June 2019, almost a year ago. The Henriksen Bldg in Tahoe City finally came down, time for the Gold Crest, Falcon Lodge and Ferreri Crown to be demolished before any recommendation or approval is provided.

You, as commissioners, should forward a condition that the applicant must demolition ALL the blighted buildings this building season to the Board of Supervisors (BOS) as part of your recommendation today.

This is not about a new lovely place to have luxury condos. It is about selective enforcement, failure to uphold legal statutes and abuse of discretionary powers. I respect laws and policies and hope that you feel as I do and ask the BOS to enforce them. This developer misled the Kings Beach and North Lake Tahoe communities into believing they had a plan for a Town Center. Fast forward to 2020 and the development team is still stating they cannot build a hotel on the LAST LAKESIDE property available in Kings Beach in the Town Center where it belongs.

Also note, there are two condo projects already in the North Tahoe East Plan. 1). The Peak 10 condos (Completed and sold-out) next to the North Tahoe Event Center (on the lakeside) and the former Wood Vista Lodge site near Safeway on the mountain-side (nearly completed and for sale). WE DO NOT NEED ANOTHER CONDO PROJECT. WE NEED A HOTEL.

Planning Commissioners it's up to you to stand your ground. Defend your requests that were not accomplished and send the applicant back to the drawing board. Do not make a recommendation to be forwarded to the BOS! The applicant surely wants the appeal process to be triggered

Sorry the applicant cannot find financial resources to provide a Town Center Project: The applicant should sell the current entitlements and the county should erase the Mitigated Negative Declaration.